

REMARKS

By the present amendment, the specification, the drawings and claims 1-5 have been amended to clarify their presentation and add a ratio value on page 5, claim 5 has been amended to depend on claim 3 instead of claim 1, and new claims 6-11 have been added. Support for the ratio value of about three is found in the original Figures to which the original sentence of page 5, third paragraph, refers, in particular in Figure 3, and support for claims 6-11 is found in the original application, in particular on page 5, third and fifth paragraphs.

Claims 1-11 are pending in the present application.

In the Office Action, the drawings are objected to as not showing the chassis recited in claim 1 and the pin recited in claim 4.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested. It is submitted that the chassis is partially shown on Fig. 3 (and Fig. 7). The specification and Fig. 3 have been amended to show the reference 11 for the partially shown chassis. Further, the term "pin" has been deleted from claim 4. Accordingly, it is submitted that the objection should be withdrawn.

Next, in the Office Action, claims 3-5 are objected to for using the terms "its main side" in claim 3 and "it is" in claim 5 and for the dependency of claim 4.

Claims 1 and 3 have been amended to refer to the lever instead of "it". Further, it is submitted that the dependency of claim 4 is appropriate, while claim 5 has been amended to depend on claim 3 instead of claim 1. Accordingly, it is submitted that the objection should be withdrawn.

Next, in the Office Action, claims 3-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as indefinite. It is alleged that the terms "that receptacles" in claim 3 and "the pins" in claim 4 lack antecedent basis.

The words "in that" have been deleted before "receptacles" in claim 3 and the term "the pins" has been deleted in claim 4. Accordingly, it is submitted that the rejection should be withdrawn.

Next, in the Office Action, claims 1, 2 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as anticipated by JP 301270 (Yamada).

The rejection is respectfully traversed. It is submitted that the present application is a national stage of PCT/FR00/01783 filed on June 26, 2000. Accordingly, Yamada, which has a publication date of October 30, 2001, is not prior art under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) or (a).

In view of the above, it is submitted that the rejection should be withdrawn.

In conclusion, the invention as presently claimed is patentable. It is believed that the claims are in allowable condition and a notice to that effect is earnestly requested.

In the event there is, in the Examiner's opinion, any outstanding issue and such issue may be resolved by means of a telephone interview, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Serial Number: 10/030,150

Group Art Unit: 2853

In the event this paper is not considered to be timely filed, the Applicants hereby petition for an appropriate extension of the response period. Please charge the fee for such extension and any other fees which may be required to our Deposit Account No. 50-2866.

Respectfully submitted,

WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP



Nicolas E. Seckel
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 44,373

Atty. Docket No.: 020093
1250 Connecticut Avenue NW Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20036
Tel: (202) 822-1100
Fax: (202) 822-1111
Customer No.: 38834
NES:rep

Encls.: Substitute sheet of drawings
Marked-up version